## Mereddress w. Liner

> Delete Reply Reply All Forward as Attachment
Move To: Trash
Date: Sun, 18 Jul 2004 11:21:11 AM EDT
From: Ralph Leonard < ralph.leonard@usa.net> Add to Address Book   Block Sender   Allow Sender   NEW
To: "Bleck, Carolyn" <carolyn.bleck@uspto.gov></carolyn.bleck@uspto.gov>
Subject: RE: 10/054,504 Allow Subject NEW
More Details   Print Preview
Hi Ms. Bleck,
Please let me know what address I should send the formal status inquiry to, and is this a special form or will a letter I write suffice? Also, if it is not going to you please let me know to whom I should address it.
Thanks, Ralph
"Bleck, Carolyn" < <u>Carolyn.Bleck@USPTO.GOV</u> > wrote:
> Dear Ralph - > Please give me a call and I can explain to you what you need to do. I can write a formal written interview summary after speaking with you which will be entered in the case. I would prefer to communicate over the phone rather than in writing. If you want to communicate in writing, please send your questions in a formal status inquiry to the USPTO. If it is easier, I can give you a call when it is convenient for you. > Thank you, > Carolyn Bleck > ——Original Message——
> From: Ralph Leonard [mailto: <u>ralph.leonard@usa.net]</u> > Sent: Friday, July 16, 2004 2:30 PM > To: Bleck, Carolyn > Subject: RE: 10/054,504
>
> Hi Carolyn, >
> Thanks for the note. I understand and respect USPTO's policy so formal surface
> mail would be fine. My address is:
> Ralph Leonard, MD, MPH
> P.O. Box 26516 > St. Louis Park, MN 55426
> At this point I am less interested in what the patent's merits may be upon  > preliminary review and far more interested to be assured that I am not the  > victim of discrimination because I have not hired a lawyer; although I may be
> naive, it seems very implausible that wealthy high-tech businesses also have
> to wait 5 years to get their proposals reviewed by the USPTO given that even

> year seems a long time in software and technology fields, like the one my

>

```
> patent is in.
> In your formal correspondence to me please include reference to specific
> to expedite this that you alluded to earlier.
> thanks,
> Ralph
> "Bleck, Carolyn" < Carolyn.Bleck@USPTO.GOV > wrote:
>> Hi Ralph -
>> I am not allowed to communicate via email about the merits of the case.
> would appreciate if we could communicate via telephone. It is USPTO policy
> not use email as a form of communication.
> > Thanks.
> > Carolyn
>> ----Original Message-
> > From: Ralph Leonard [mailto:ralph.leonard@usa.net]
> Sent: Thursday, July 15, 2004 8:51 PM
> > To: Bleck, Carolyn
> > Subject: RE: 10/054,504
>>
>>
> > Hi Ms. Bleck,
>> It's my personal policy to document all communications in writing, either
> > email or postal service. I look forward to your answer to my question as
to
> 1)
>> what petition I can file (exact name please) and 2) if hiring a lawyer
> would
> > expedite the time until review.
>> Thanks.
> > Ralph
> > "Bleck, Carolyn" < Carolyn.Bleck@USPTO.GOV > wrote:
>>
>>> Hi Ralph -
>>> Please give me a call if you would like to discuss the application
> > 703-305-3981.
>>> Thanks,
> > Carolyn Bleck
>>>
>>> --- Original Message-
>>> From: Ralph Leonard [mailto:ralph.leonard@usa.net]
> > Sent: Thursday, July 15, 2004 10:17 AM
>> To: Bleck, Carolyn
>> Subject: RE: 10/054,504
>>>
>>>
>> > Hi Carolyn,
>>> I'm surprised by your answer since I filed two patents after that one
> > > those have made far more progress. Do all applicants endure this same
> > degree
> > of delay, including those from major technology companies (it seems
>>> technology changes so fast that a turn around of 6 years would not be
> > viable)
```

ì

```
>> or is this a disadvantage only reserved for those without lawyers or
> filing
>> non-big-business claims?
>>>
>>> Also, please be more specific as to what petition I may file -- there
are
> > so
>>> many forms.
>>>
>>> thanks,
> > > Ralph
>>>
>>> "Bleck, Carolyn" < Carolyn.Bleck@USPTO.GOV > wrote:
>>>
>>> Ralph-
>>> We are currently working on cases at the end of 2000. I would
estimate
> > that
>>> it will be at least 2 years until the case is worked on. To expedite
>>> process, I would suggest filing a petition to make special.
>>> Carolyn Bleck
>>>>
>>> ----Original Message----
>>> From: Ralph Leonard [mailto:ralph.leonard@usa.net]
>>> Sent: Wednesday, July 14, 2004 11:08 AM
>>> To: Bleck, Carolyn
>>> Subject: 10/054,504
>>>>
>>>>
>>> Hi Ms. Bleck,
>>>>
>>> I was wondering when I would hear further notice regarding patent
> > 10/054,504
>>>> that appears to have last had activity by your office in February of
> > 2003.
>>>>
>>> I'd appreciate an estimate of the time until this process resumes and
> > what
>>> other actions I can take to expedite it.
>>>>
>>> Thanks.
>>> Ralph
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>
>>
>>
>
>
```

Ą

© 2004 USA.NET®, Inc. All Rights Reserved. U.S. Patent # 5,937,161. Users of this site agree to be bound by Net@ddress <u>Terms and Conditions</u>.



## PATENT APPLICATION INFORMATION RETRIEVAL



Search results for application number: 10/054,504				
Application Number:		Customer Number:	•	
Filing or 371(c) Date:	01-22-2002	Status:	Docketed New Case - Ready for Examination	
Application Type:	Utility	Status Date:	09-06-2002	
Examiner Name:	BLECK, CAROLYN M	Location:	ELECTRONIC	
Group Art Unit:		Location Date:	-	
Confirmation Number:	4759	Earliest Publication No:	US 2003-0171657 A1	
Attorney Docket Number:		Earliest Publication Date:	09-11-2003	
Class/ Sub-Class:	705/002	Patent Number:	-	
	Ralph Leonard, New Haven, CT (US)	Issue Date of Patent:		
Title Of Invention: Selection of optimal medication methodology (SOOMM)			gy (SOOMM)	

## **Search Options**

Published Documents

-	File History		
Date	Contents Description		
02-13-2003	Case Docketed to Examiner in GAU		
09-06-2002	Case Docketed to Examiner in GAU		
06-18-2002	Application Dispatched from OIPE		
05-28-2002	Application Is Now Complete		
04-23-2002	Additional Application Filing Fees		
04-23-2002	Applicant has submitted a new specification to correct Corrected Papers problems		
03-19-2002	Corrected Paper		
03-08-2002	IFW Scan & PACR Auto Security Review		
02-05-2002	IFW Scan & PACR Auto Security Review		
01-22-2002	Initial Exam Team nn		